

**CITY OF SHOREVIEW
CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP MEETING
June 11, 2012**

Attending:

Council: Acting Mayor Huffman, Councilmembers Quigley, Wickstrom,
Withhart

Mayor Martin was absent.

Staff: City Manager Terry Schwerm
Community Development Director Tom Simonson
City Planner Kathleen Nordine
Public Works Director Mark Maloney

Economic Development
Commission: Dave Lukowitz
Gene Marsh
Jeff Washburn
Josh Wing

Planning
Commission: Chair Solomonson
Commissioner Ferrington
Commissioner McCool
Commissioner Proud
Commissioner Thompson

Acting Mayor Huffman called the June 11, 2012 City Council workshop meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON SIGNAGE

Ms. Nordine stated that staff is proposing to amend City sign regulations pertaining to temporary signs to allow more flexibility and streamline the process. Currently, electronic message signs are allowed only in public and quasi public districts. The Economic Development Commission (EDC) believes Shoreview businesses are at a disadvantage. If message boards were allowed, there may not be a need for as many temporary signs.

Councilmember Withhart asked if message boards would be a permanent structure. Ms. Nordine stated that portable signs are not permitted. Message Boards would have to be permanent. Mr. Schwerm added that reader boards would likely have to be incorporated into the permanent monument signs.

Commissioner Ferrington asked if businesses receive sign regulation information when they move to Shoreview. Mr. Simonson answered, no, because the City does not track

small businesses coming in. Mr. Schwerm added that if a business is part of a larger development, there is typically a Comprehensive Sign Plan, and they would be aware of sign regulations. Most businesses are under a Comprehensive Sign Plan.

Commissioner Ferrington stated that electronic signs are a disadvantage to small businesses. She suggested a letter to owners of multi-tenant buildings to develop an effective way to communicate sign code regulations to new businesses.

Councilmember Withhart suggested a "Welcome" regulation packet be discussed for implementation by the EDC.

Commissioner Solomonson stated that his concern with message board signs is how to enforce the number of events advertised and the time duration of messages. He asked if message centers could replace the need for temporary signs so they can be forbidden. Another issue is controlling content.

Commissioner Proud challenged the necessity for temporary signs. There should be an objective study that shows the benefit received from signage. However, he understands that message boards used in border cities force Shoreview businesses to compete and upgrade whether they work or not.

Councilmember Wickstrom stated while being mindful of City guidelines, there is a need to decide how strict the regulations should be. Message signs are an expensive investment. When there are too many signs, it becomes clutter and no one sees or reads them. One clear sign is better than 20 temporary signs.

Marsh stated that due to the economy, Mall businesses don't have a lot of money and won't invest in a message sign for the Mall. On the other hand, it is a struggle to put up with temporary signs in the windows of some establishments all year.

Councilmember Quigley stated that competition is intense. The City has a high bar for sign standards, which should be kept. He has no objection to making the ordinance more flexible. Ideas are needed on how to communicate to businesses the City's direction for sign regulation. He emphasized the need for communication with businesses. He suggested information on the City website with graphics to show what is not allowed.

Mr. Simonson stated that one opportunity to communicate with businesses is through the Business Exchange. It is better to build pressure from tenants on owners for enforcement than having enforcement come from the City.

Councilmember Withhart stated that signs are a necessary part of business. The problem is when temporary signs become a permanent part of the landscape. Electronic reader board signs have dropped in price and their features have increased with color and control from a computer. He agreed the City should work toward only

allowing electronic reader boards. He would like to see a deadline set for a transition away from allowing temporary signs.

Commissioner Thompson asked how it would be determined who gets priority for their information on the reader sign. She believes it would be difficult for the City to move away from all temporary signs.

Commissioner Lukowitz stated that it is a matter of process. He would like to see a public hearing at the Council level with information published in the local paper to have a public discussion with businesses about signage. He suggested planning two years out before banning temporary signs in order to give businesses time to plan.

Marsh stated that there will need to be an intense time of enforcement of existing violations, so that businesses will see the need to comply rather than lose money paying fines.

Commissioner McCool agreed and suggested dealing with the worst offenders first. This will only work if it can be done on a manageable level. While encouraging all businesses to comply, staff can focus on the offenders.

Acting Mayor Huffman stated that there is consensus that permanent monument signs are not a problem. The direction is to develop a plan that would only allow electronic reader boards but also to continue to move forward with added flexibility on other temporary signage. He noted that Mayor Martin agrees that the sign ordinance should have more flexibility.

It was the consensus of the group to continue with revisions to the ordinance and expand regulations to include electronic signs on monument signs.

DISCUSSION REGARDING PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT PROGRAM

Mr. Schwerm stated that in 2010, the legislature created a Council on Local Results and Innovation (CLRI) to encourage performance management by local government. A set of 10 performance measures was developed for cities with incentives from the State in the form of \$0.14 per capita with a maximum of \$25,000, and exemption from levy limits. The City received approximately \$3,500. At this time there are no levy limits.

In June 2011, Shoreview adopted 23 performance measures to be incorporated into the budget. This year the CLRI has stipulated that in order to qualify for reimbursement, a report must be filed declaring the City has: 1) adopted a minimum of 10 performance measures; 2) implemented a local performance measurement system developed by CLRI; 3) report results of performance measures to residents before the end of 2012; and 4) survey residents on services in performance benchmarks before end of 2012.

A key issue is the City would be the need for an annual community survey. A smaller community survey than the comprehensive one done every three to four years would be

an annual cost of \$4,000 to \$5,000. A smaller annual survey would increase potential variability of the information gathered. Further, the measurable outcome goals would mean restructuring a part of the narrative goals in the budget document. The City is not required to participate in this program. The Finance Director has been using performance measurements, although not specifically as laid out by the legislature. The only benefit to the City would be the exemption from levy limits. If the legislature were to enact street tax levies and debt service, it could impact future capital improvement plans.

Councilmember Wickstrom stated that as the City is already doing enough with performance measurement, it would not be cost effective for the City to participate. This is micromanagement.

Councilmember Withhart stated that the value is adequate reporting and setting goals. That information is available to Shoreview residents. Making more reports is not of value.

Councilmember Quigley stated that the City has worked on a planning outcome basis philosophy for years. This program is not relevant to Shoreview.

It was the consensus of the Council that current performance measures incorporated into the budget are adequate and do not need to be tied to the state. It does not make sense to comply with this reporting for \$3,500. The negative would be no exemption from levy limits, if they are imposed.

DISCUSSION REGARDING CREATION OF A SHOREVIEW CARING YOUTH AWARD

The Shoreview Human Rights Commission has a very successful poster contest each year but receives very few essays for the essay contest. In researching activities of other cities, staff found that Golden Valley, Minnetonka and Hopkins collaborate with the school district to sponsor a Caring Youth Recognition event to recognize caring contributions of youth to the community. Each year they receive approximately 50 applications. The Shoreview Human Rights Commission would like to see a similar program implemented. Mayor Martin has expressed some concern that it would conflict with the Northwest Youth and Family Services Service to Youth Award.

Councilmember Quigley stated that it is a great idea, but there would have to be input from the school. The school would have to do the work assessing what youth are doing. He questioned whether such a program could be sustained and whether it would have much meaning. He would not want to see a “feel-good” award with no meaning. There must be tangible achievement to be considered.

Councilmember Withhart stated that there would be value for whoever wins. It is another thing to add to one’s resume. He would clarify whether one or all categories have to be met.

Councilmember Wickstrom stated that the Human Rights Commission would do the work. She would like to give them a chance to develop this idea. She noted that it would have more meaning if there is a scholarship.

It was the consensus of the Council to encourage the Human Rights Commission to develop a Caring Youth Award program.

OTHER ISSUES

Noise Analysis

Mr. Maloney reported that it is difficult to get an objective noise analysis in regard to concerns expressed about noise from concrete pavement that was recently put in. Quotes to make modifications to the road would be in the range of \$33,000 to \$40,000. Mr. Schwerm explained that where joints occur in the road, there is a small indentation that causes noise from car tires when they travel over the dip. The modifications would be an improvement, but at a cost.

Councilmember Withhart noted that the resident states that there is noise in her basement. This is not a busy street. He asked if water pipes would amplify the noise. Mr. Maloney stated that the street carries approximately 160 cars per day.

Mr. Schwerm noted that at the assessment hearing there were three or four people who complained about the noise.

It was the consensus of the Council that staff meet with the residents to better assess the traffic noise and report back to the Council.

The meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.